REMARKS

In this reply, claims 1-4, 8-13, and 16-17 are being amended. Support for the amendments can be found on page 31, lines 2-4 and lines 20-25, page 32, lines 2-12, page 33, lines 4-10 of the originally submitted application, and also in the originally submitted claim language. Claims 6-7 and 14-15 are being canceled. Reconsideration of the application and the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 allegedly because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In this reply, claims 14 and 15 are being canceled. Cancellation of the claims obviates the section 101 rejections.

Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because the specification allegedly fails to point out the structures required to perform the "means for" limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification, at least on page 22, line 19 to page 23, line 8, describes that the processes of generating, editing, and recording a diagnosis is performed by the system shown in Fig. 2A, and that the processes described in the specification are performed by the CPU of a server and terminal devices shown in Fig. 2B. The specification in that passage also mentions control program stored in a storage unit, and that the processes are realized by the CPU of respective devices. Figs. 1 and 2B also show displays units of a computer system. At least by those description and drawings, applicants believe the "means for" structures are clearly presented in the originally submitted application.

Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,047,259 to Campbell et al. ("Campbell"). In this reply, without conceding to the propriety of the rejections, applicants are amending claims 1-4, 8-13, and 16-17. Claims 1, 9-13 and 16-17 are independent.

Campbell as understood by applicants discloses an interactive management system for managing physical exams, diagnosis, and prescription. Campbell, however, does not disclose every element claimed in independent claims and dependent claims as amended. For example, Campbell fails to disclose or suggest at least, "the observation text generation unit generates the observation text by arranging a word and phrase that have been, in advance, associated with the supplementary information relating to the selection result obtained by the supplementary information result obtaining unit before and after the observation term relating to the selection result obtained by the observation term selection result obtaining unit," claimed in independent claim 1 and similarly claimed in independent claims 9-13 and 16-17 as amended.

The originally presented claim 7, which is now canceled, recited the element of generating the observation text. The Office Action in rejecting claim 7 alleges that in Campbell's Fig. 1, Campbell's keyboard generates claimed observation text. Applicants disagree. In Campbell, unlike the allegation in the Office Action, text generation process is not automated or performed by a processor. Rather, Campbell's system operator manually generates its text.

On the other hand, in the new observation input process of the present disclosure (shown in Figs. 6A and 6B) and as claimed, a CPU performs the process in which text is generated by

arranging, before and after an observation term, a word or phrase that is associated with a selected attribute, particular region (i.e., supplementary information), or like. In other words, in the present application, a system operator does not generate observation text. Rather a CPU automatically generates observation text.

The keyboard disclosed in Campbell does not perform such an operation. The keyboard in Campbell is a device through which a user manually enters commands into the personal computer.

For at least the above reasons, independent claims 1, 9-13 and 16-17, and their respective dependent claims at least by virtue of dependencies are not anticipated by Campbell.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course.

Respectfully submitted,

Eunhee Park

Eunhee Park
Registration No. 42,976

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, N.Y. 11530
(516) 742-4343

EP:vh